



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/520,310

01/05/2005

Martinus Bernardus Van Der Mark

NL 020666

2500

24737

7590

12/10/2008

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS

P.O. BOX 3001

BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

HEYI, HENOK G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2627

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/10/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/520,310	<b>Applicant(s)</b> VAN DER MARK ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> HENOK G. HEYI	<b>Art Unit</b> 2627	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 October 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-10 and 12-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-10 and 12-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 January 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 10/02/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that no person of ordinary skill in the art would interpret that a layer deposition on a surface of an optical surface would be a deposition solely touching an edge of the optical surface. But the deposition of the moisture barrier that is shown in Fig. 2 of Higuchi is not only touching an edge but covers two surfaces. The surfaces that are covered by the moisture barrier are the bottom surface of the substrate and the top surface of layer 4 (a moisture barrier layer 5a of the same type as that described above is provided on the outer surface of the substrate 1, on all of the edge faces of the substrate 1, on all of the edge faces of a plurality of the layer 2, 3 and 4 provided on the substrate 1, and on the outer surface of the second dielectric layer 4, col 4 lines 58-65).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 2-4, 6-10 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Novotny et al. 6,069,853 (Novotny hereinafter) in view of Higuchi et al. 5,311,500 (Higuchi hereinafter).

Regarding claim 12, Novotny teaches an optical recording and reading system (see Fig. 1), the system comprising: a laser configured to provide a focused radiation beam (optical head is configured to produce a lensing effect and thereby to focus the beam to the recording layer, col 3 lines 33-36); an optical data storage medium comprising (150, Fig. 5A): a substrate (the substrate is formed of a plastic layer, col 5 lines 60-63), and a recording stack formed on the substrate having a first optical surface remote from the substrate, wherein the recording stack is configured for recording by the focused radiation beam (layers on 150, Fig. 1); and an optical head (140, Fig. 1), with an objective arranged on a recording stack side of the optical data storage medium and having a second optical surface closest to the recording stack, from which objective the focused radiation beam emanates during recording (142, Fig. 1), but Novotny fails to teach at least one of the first optical surface has deposited a transparent hydrophobic layer on a surface of the first optical surface remote from the recording stack or the second optical surface has deposited a transparent hydrophobic layer on a surface of the second optical surface remote from the focused radiation beam, wherein the transparent hydrophobic layer is deposited to extend substantially in a direction of the first optical surface. However, Higuchi teaches a moisture barrier by the side of each layer in the medium as shown in Fig. 2.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the recording medium of Novotny to include a moisture barrier deposit. The modification would have been obvious because of the benefit of the

Art Unit: 2627

moisture barrier in keeping the substrate and other layers of the recording medium from crack that would have been caused by moisture (see Higuchi col 3 lines 28-33).

Regarding claim 2, Higuchi teaches the system according to claim 12, wherein the second optical surface has deposited the hydrophobic layer with a thickness substantially equal to  $0.25 \lambda / n$  (col 4 lines 35-47).

Regarding claim 3, Higuchi teaches the system according to claim 12, wherein the second optical surface has deposited a hydrophylic layer (5, see col 3 lines 25-30) on a surface of the second optical surface remote from the focused radiation beam that has a thickness substantially equal to  $0.25 \lambda / n$  (col 4 lines 35-47).

Regarding claim 4, Novotny teaches the system according to claim 12, wherein the optical head (140, Fig. 5A) further comprises a magnetic coil (604, Fig. 6A) arranged at a side of the optical head (140) closest to the recording stack (152, Fig. 1) such that an optical axis of the optical head (140) traverses the center of the magnetic coil (604) and the recording stack (152) of the optical data storage medium (150) is of the magneto-optical type.

Regarding claim 6, Higuchi teaches a system according to any one of claims 12 and 2-5, wherein the hydrophobic layer (moisture barrier, col 3 lines 28-33) comprises a material selected from the group of poly-para-xylylenes, fluorocarbons and copolymers of fluorocarbons (col 3, lines 24-60).

Regarding claim 7, Higuchi teaches the system according to any one of claims 4-5, wherein the focused radiation beam has a wavelength  $\lambda$ , wherein the transparent

Art Unit: 2627

hydrophobic layer has a refractive index  $n$ , and wherein the magnetic coil is contained in a partially transparent slider, that is adapted for flying at a distance of  $>0.5 \lambda / n$  and  $2 \mu\text{m}$  from the first optical surface (col 4 lines 35-50).

Regarding claim 8, Novotny teaches an optical data storage medium (150, Fig. 1) having a recording stack (152), formed on a substrate (160), said recording stack suitable for recording by means of a focused radiation beam (see Fig. 1), with a wavelength  $\lambda$  in air (a beam at a specified wavelength, col 3 line 17), but fails to teach explicitly about the recording stack having a first optical surface most remote from the substrate, characterized in that the first optical surface (6) is provided with a transparent hydrophobic layer (10) that has a refractive index  $n$  and has a thickness smaller than  $0.5 \lambda / n$ , wherein the transparent hydrophobic layer is deposited to extend substantially in a direction of the first optical surface. However, Higuchi teaches the moisture barrier layer 5 is provided to prevent the substrate 1 from absorbing moisture. Specifically, when the substrate 1 expands with absorbing moisture, a stress imbalance arises between the substrate 1 and a plurality of the layers 2, 3 and 4 provided on the substrate 1 (col 3 lines 28-33). Higuchi also teaches that the layer thickness is dependent on the refractive index  $n$  and the wavelength  $\lambda$  (col 4 lines 35-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the optical recording and reading system of Novotny to include a data storage medium that has hydrophobic (moisture barrier) layers with thickness that depend on the wavelength and refractive index. The modification would have been

Art Unit: 2627

obvious because of the benefit of avoiding contamination of lens due to moisture and other contaminants.

Regarding claim 9, Higuchi teaches the optical data storage medium according to claim 8, wherein the hydrophobic layer that has a thickness smaller than  $0.25 \lambda / n$  (col 4 lines 35-47).

Regarding claim 10, Higuchi teaches the optical data storage medium according to claim 8 or 9, wherein the hydrophobic layer comprises a material selected from the group of poly-para-xylylenes, fluorocarbons and copolymers thereof (col 3, lines 24-60).

Regarding claim 13, Novotny teaches the system according to claim 12, wherein the objective is adapted for recording/reading at a free working distance from the first optical surface smaller than  $50\mu\text{m}$  (configured to operate in a "near-field" configuration where the optical head and the optical medium are spaced from each other by a distance on the order of or less than one wavelength, col 1 lines 34-49).

Regarding claim 14, Higuchi teaches a method of manufacturing an optical data storage medium (col 3 lines 24-col 5 line 10), the method comprising acts of: providing a substrate (1); depositing a recording stack on the substrate (2, 3 and 4), wherein the recording stack is suitable for recording by a focused radiation beam with a wavelength in air, depositing a transparent hydrophobic layer on an optical surface of the recording stack most remote from the substrate, wherein the hydrophobic layer has a refractive index  $n$  and has a thickness smaller than  $0.5 \lambda / n$ , wherein the transparent hydrophobic layer is deposited to extend substantially in a direction of the first optical

Art Unit: 2627

surface (a moisture barrier layer 5a of the same type as that described above is provided on the outer surface of the substrate 1, on all of the edge faces of the substrate 1, on all of the edge faces of a plurality of the layer 2, 3 and 4 provided on the substrate 1, and on the outer surface of the second dielectric layer 4, col 4 lines 58-65).

4. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Novotny et al. 6,069,853 (Novotny hereinafter) in view of Higuchi et al. 5,311,500 (Higuchi hereinafter) as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Davis et al. 6,058,094 (Davis hereinafter).

Regarding claim 5, Novotny teaches a system according to claim 4, with a magnetic coil (604, Fig. 6A) but both Novotny and Higuchi fail to teach the size of the inner diameter of the magnetic coil is smaller than 60µm. However, Davis teaches that the inner diameter along the major axis of the magnetic coil 460 on a lower surface comprises approximately 46 microns and along the minor axis approximately 40 microns. (Col 10 lines 31-33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the magnetic coil of Novotny to have a diameter smaller than 60µm as taught by Davis. The modification would have been obvious because of the benefit of strong magnetic field.

### **Contact**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HENOK G. HEYI whose telephone number is (571)270-1816. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:30 to 5:00 EST.



Art Unit: 2627

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Joseph H. Feild/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art  
Unit 2627

/Henok G Heyi/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2627